

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office is requiring restriction to one of the following groups:

Group I: Claims 1-10 and 29-31, drawn to a process;

Group II: Claims 11-27, drawn to a substrate; and

Group III: Claim 28, drawn to a glazing assembly.

Applicants elect with traverse Group I, Claims 1-10 and 29-31, for examination.

Restriction is only proper if the claims of the restricted groups are independent or patentably distinct and there would be a serious burden placed on the Office if restriction is not required (MPEP §803). The burden is on the Office to provide reasons and/or examples to support any conclusion in regard to patentable distinction (MPEP § 803). Moreover, when citing lack of unity of invention in a national stage application, the Office has the burden of explaining why each group lacks unity with the others (MPEP § 1893.03(d)), i.e. why a single general inventive concept is nonexistent. The lack of a single inventive concept must be specifically described.

The Office alleges that Groups I-III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical feature for the following reasons: “The special technical feature of the present invention, a substrate comprising a coating with photocatalytic properties, wherein the fcoating comprises at least partially crystallized titanium oxide in anatase form, in rutile form, in brookite form, or in the form of a mixture of anatase, rutile and brookite, does not define a contribution over the prior art, as revealed by Boire et al...”

Annex B of the Administrative Instructions under the PCT, paragraph b (Technical Relationship), states, emphasis added:

The expression “special technical feature” is defined in Rule 13.2 as meaning those technical features that defines a contribution which each of the inventions, ***considered as a whole***, makes over the prior art. The determination is made on the contents of the claims as ***interpreted in light of the description*** and drawings (if any).

Applicants respectfully submit that the Office did not consider the contribution of each invention, *as a whole*, in alleging the lack of a special technical feature. Applicants also respectfully submit that the Office has not provided any indication that the contents of the claims *interpreted in light of the description* were considered in making this allegation. Therefore, the Office has not met the burden necessary to support the assertion of a lack of unity of the invention.


For the reasons presented above, Applicants submit that the Office has failed to meet the burden necessary in order to sustain the requirement for restriction. Applicants therefore request that the requirement for restriction be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above-identified application is now in condition for examination on the merits, and early notice thereof is earnestly solicited.

Customer Number
22850
Tel. (703) 413-3000
Fax. (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

Respectfully Submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Richard L. Treanor
Registration No. 36,379

Stefan Koschmieder
Registration No. 50,238